

The Dynamics of Light and Dark  
Guy Anderson, M.A.

# Chapter One: Introduction

In recent times, humanity has been far more able to discover and examine the world around them, and beyond. Advances in empirical science, along with the recent development of space technology, have spurred numerous investigations into the nature and being of not only the world, but also the solar system and to a lesser extent the universe itself. In general, humanity is far less ignorant of both the terrestrial environment and the cosmic environment than they used to be, even if no one is quite sure how many planets there are in the solar system.

However, while humanity has increasingly become very aware of the dynamics of the environment, there is still quite a bit of ignorance, or perhaps even unwillingness, to try to understand humanity in and of itself. This may sound silly and false at first, but the sciences that gave way to crafting, architecture, geometry, algebra, calculus and physics by and large vastly preceded the schools of thought that gave way to psychology, sociology, anthropology, and perhaps even philosophy. Even though philosophy can be found even before Socrates, there was hardly any consensus within that field for there was not much observable fact, or common ground, between what the various philosophers were studying. Geometry, conversely, was able to develop quite a fair amount before it became the subject of philosophy or any supposed 'sacredness', for there was much observable fact that supported both the foundation and the development of that science. While philosophy did indeed inspire the sciences and perhaps even create some fields of science itself (with psychology being, perhaps, the prime and latest example), it was by no means the queen of sciences, for science (however limited and shallow) did come before it, and will still exist when or if philosophy is no longer widely revered or studied.

In any case, humanity still has a lot to learn about who, and what they are. Can philosophy solve this problem? The author dare says that while philosophy can provide many examples and guidelines of how things 'ought' to be concerning various matters, it often falls short of allowing, or at least explaining, the state of how things actually are (although there are exceptions, with Henri Bergson perhaps being one). Psychology could probably provide a more satisfactory explanation of the true nature of humanity, however it is still a very new science and there are many conflicting viewpoints and schools of thought within that science; it has yet to reach a homogenous state of knowledge, and perhaps never will, for better or worse. With that in mind, psychology may also not be able to be relied upon.

The question now is this: "What then?" Perhaps it would be best to take an alternate and unorthodox approach in order to investigate the nature of humanity. The issue here, is that the nature of humanity is in some ways very simple, but in most ways highly complex, so complex that not only could not just one science be substantial to address it, but also that the collective knowledge of all of the sciences today could probably not be able to properly explain it when working together, at least not in a short amount of time. For from the various sciences have sprung multiple models of consciousness, each being supported by the research and data of the involved sciences, or perhaps sometimes more accurately, the ruling zeitgeist and political opinions of the scientists and professionals.

Perhaps the wisest way to address the issue of the true nature of humanity would be to tackle

a group of aspects that do not completely define the nature, but nonetheless do accurately reduce it to the essential dynamics that are found in virtually every human being. Not only would this be universal in application, but it would also be clear, concise, and simple to understand and expand upon when further development is needed. When this approach is done in a simplistic fashion, it is not done in order to avoid or ignore the complicated aspects of the nature of humanity, but rather to get down to the core set (or at least a core set) of dynamics that guide human thought and behavior. It is also done in order to avoid contradictions, however apparent or supposed they are.

This document will address the nature of humanity through the metaphor of “Light and Dark”, for from the author's independent research into occult literature, this duality seems to be the one metaphor that could be the most appropriately applied to the nature of humanity. Other terminology and ideas from the occult sciences will also be implemented, for the author believes that not only are such terms and ideas highly appropriate to the issue, but also that the occult sciences are by and large neglected and the ideas from them are often silenced when they could indeed be fruitful in both study and application. Psychology will also be implemented due to its high relevance, and since this document will obviously go into metaphysics, philosophy is also somewhat relevant, and cannot be ignored.

It must be said that this document is by no means authoritative or conclusive; this document is by and large merely just a pondering of the author, an arching theory that tries to explain the nature of humanity in a way that has never been done before, or at least is rarely done. While it may fail in including all of the details concerning the issue, it could also be said that so long as this document paints the general picture while allowing the small details to be as they are, then no serious errors can be made.

## **Chapter Two: A Basic Definition of Light and Dark**

The terms “Light” and “Dark” sound fairly vague and nebulous, and using them to describe anything outside of human spirituality and ideology would be highly unorthodox at best, and downright laughable in general. As these terms do at first seem to lack any real practicality or meaning, when examined more closely they reveal themselves to be fairly useful when applied to nature of humanity.

“Light” and “Dark” both have the foundations of their definitions being based on a sort of “mystical physics”; this phrase may seem to be nonsensical, and perhaps it would be when applied to most things, however by describing the foundations of the definitions one will see how such a phrase is indeed both appropriate and relevant. The foundations of the definitions of these terms are rooted in a simple physical phenomena: the ability to see, or at least be seen. Those things (be they either concrete or abstract in existence) that are in the light, can be seen and known, whereas those things that are in the darkness are not seen, and not known. Humans tend to appreciate things that are known and thus readily seen and available, and tend to shun, avoid, or otherwise not focus on the things that are not seen and not known.

Thus, the physical aspect of “mystical physics” is explained. However, what of the mystical aspect? The mystical aspect, is the one that emphasizes the spiritual or phenomenal elements of what is deemed to be “Light” and “Dark”. Humanity in general tends to put greater

meaning behind their perceptions; this has been the case throughout most, if not all, of its history. While it may lead to erroneous judgments and behaviors (as will be discussed in the following chapters), this is actually a decent way to form thoughts and beliefs which may help with the way they process information and make decisions. As was stated before, humans tend to prefer the known to the unknown, what is seen over what is not. Thus, what falls into the “Light” category is given greater meaning in that it is what is typically valued, and put into use, whereas what falls into the “Dark” category is what is not valued, and is generally left in ignorance, if not outright rejected and forbidden.

One could ask, what is the importance of this? What difference does this all make, and of what practical value does this have? These questions can be answered with a statement of a simple fact: humanity lives in vast environment, where even in the most secluded of places there are a plenitude of many things that can and cannot be seen, and for all, judgments and decisions have to be made. When the term “things” is brought up, this term can apply to anything and everything: what kind of fruits are on a tree, what kind of nutrients or toxins are in those fruits, whether or not the sun is going to rise in the east and fall in the west, the people that one has to interact with, the thoughts and emotions within those people, as well as the thoughts and emotions within oneself. The list of “things”, vastly outnumber how many concrete entities there are out there, for many things that are in existence do not (at least purely) reside in the physical realm, even if they require a physical host. It is potentially limitless how many things can be recognized, and thus be valued or dis-valued.

As such, there is the importance; even a simpleton can at least glean the relevance that was just described. This is, essentially, what “Light” and “Dark” come down to: the spiritual or the phenomenal judgments of what is recognized, or at least what seems to be recognized, for it is quite possible to make a judgment of something without knowing its true nature, or all of its aspects. However, this is just the beginning; there is still much to be said about the dynamics between the “Light” and the “Dark”. And all of that, resides within nature of humanity.

## **Chapter Three: The Dynamics**

When the subject of the nature of humanity is brought up, one may wonder how such a subject can be defined. What are, exactly, the distinct aspects and properties of the nature of humanity? It seems that the best way to define the nature of humanity, is to establish the fact that the entity of the human individual is both the source and the catalyst of the nature, and that such a nature is brought about not only from the individual's private thoughts and emotions, but also from the interactions between other individuals which manifest from various degrees of socialization and congregation and the resulting thoughts, emotions and behaviors on both the group level and the participant level.

From this alone, however, it is not made clear how the concepts of “Light” and “Dark” are relevant. They are actually very relevant, as can be illustrated in a relatively simple model of human interaction. Each human interaction, starts with at least two human individuals. Both have their own thoughts and emotions, with the level of intrapersonal awareness varying from person to person, however it can almost always be assumed that there is more to the individual that the individual does not know about themselves, rather than does. These two

individuals interact in a meaningful fashion, in a situation where they are either personal friends or colleagues or perhaps members of some sort of congregation. All behaviors, as well as expressed thoughts and emotions, between the two individuals during the interaction are known, or at least observable. Each individual has their own private thoughts and emotions that they may not express, and unless if one or both of the individuals have a severe social deficit each individual knows that there are things that should be kept to themselves in order to not incite any uneasiness or unnecessary drama. Both know that their relationship should be as harmonious as possible, and as such they follow an unwritten or unspoken set of rules as to what to say and do around each other, and what not to. If their identification with either each other or their congregation is particularly strong, they will likely mold their own private thoughts and emotions around the ideals and standards of the other person or the congregation. If either one oversteps the boundaries of what is socially or ideologically appropriate, then they will have to face the consequences of either the other person or the congregation, which can vary depending on various factors, such as how tolerant they are or their state of mind and emotional well-being. Essentially, when one interacts with another, one has to at least partially neglect their sense of self in favor of being more connected to others, however some people are simply not capable of this, even if they are not socially deficient.

With this basic model explained, where do the concepts of “Light” and “Dark” fall into regarding human interaction? Basically, the “Dark” would fall into the thoughts and emotions of the individuals that are not known to the other individuals, and perhaps not entirely known to the individuals who possess them. The “Light”, on the other hand, would fall into any thoughts, sentiments, beliefs and behaviors that are observed by the individuals who are interacting with one another; they are the products or the catalysts of the interaction. In short, the “Dark” is what is unknown and generally private, whereas the “Light” is what is known, shared and mutually engaged in.

Not every interaction between two individuals can be described as being “Light”, however. There may be an interaction where one individual is forced to do something that they do not want to do, or is pressured into believing in something in a particular way, or perhaps they have an interaction with someone that ends in a dissonance of some sort. In order for an interaction to be “Light”, it has to be either implicitly or explicitly agreed upon by the two individuals. When the word “implicitly” is mentioned, it is meant to signify that interactions between individuals as well as belonging to a congregation can cause subconscious changes within the individual, in both their outward interactions as well as potentially their private thoughts and emotions. Social norms and taboos within a social environment have a tremendous affect on how an individual can think and feel, typically only about certain subjects but it can extend to the individual's general cognition.

As was stated previously, the “Light” is what is embraced by most individuals, and the “Dark” is what is avoided, shunned, left in ignorance, or at least given less importance. With the basic model of human interaction defined, it becomes obvious that most individuals would give preference to the “Light”, for it promotes social growth, maintenance, and cohesion. Some individuals, however, are more focused on themselves rather than most or all of the social relations that they have, and they may try to embrace their own thoughts and emotions, wanting to know more about what is unknown, and questioning what is

supposedly deemed “right” by others. These individuals are more likely to develop their own interests and standards of what they perceive to be interesting, beautiful, and anything else of positive value. As a consequence, they may end up being discovered engaging in this by others (usually by the time they make either part or all of their individual endeavor, curiosity or exploration public) and could be socially alienated or worse.

The trend of humanity is to diverge, not to converge. As much as people want to get along and identify with others, there is such a potential wealth of diversity concerning the psychological and behavioral nature of humanity, and eventually not everyone can view the same thing in the same light, or think and behave in the same way. This is essentially the dynamic of how other congregations start; certain individuals are shunned by a social or ideological congregation that they were either once a part of, or at least exposed to, and in turn they generally find other like-minded individuals and form their own congregation. All of this seems to be too simple to be true, and such an impression would be completely understandable. However, one must keep in mind that this simplicity, the basic dynamic of “Light” and “Dark”, is based not on another simple dynamic, but on the complex and variable nature of humanity. When one acknowledges this, it becomes apparent that the concept is not necessarily an oversimplification, but rather the basic description of a species that will widely evolve into many forms on both the psychological and social levels. The general point of the metaphor isn't to make a complex entity simple, but rather to describe how a complex entity will eventually become something (or many things) that could potentially be even more complex.

## **Chapter Four: The Implications of the Dynamics**

Basically, it can surmised from what was previously stated that the “Light” is group oriented and selfless whereas the “Dark” is what is individualistic and relatively selfish. While this would be somewhat of an oversimplification, it would not be an entirely incorrect assumption to make. The aspirations of a congregation towards a universal ideal and code of conduct can indeed promote greater stability and social harmony, provided that the members of the congregation will be faithful in their endeavor and not hypocritical in their actions. And true, one's own personal emotions and thoughts can sometimes deviate too far from the norm, and depending on how the individual acts on them they can lead someone to create problems for not only other people, but perhaps also for themselves. However, what is deemed to be in the “Light” is not always what is best for everyone, and such things can cause far more conflict than anything that the “Dark” could provide. Conversely, sometimes a self-oriented nature can bring out the best in people, and there are times when insights into the “Dark” can improve humanity at large.

Think of it like this: there are multiple societies, cultures, and congregations that have their own idea what is right, and what is wrong. Due to the diversity of the human race, there is bound to be at least some disagreement as to what is right or wrong between the different groups. One really doesn't even have to leave the country or even the town that one lives in, in order to see such conflict. Such conflict can sometimes escalate into violence, for one group may see that one of their wrongs is one of the rights of another, and they will start to dehumanize the members of that group and eventually get overtly hostile. Essentially, this is

how most wars start, or at least are intensified. There is a trend here, a trend where both groups have the notion that they believe in what is absolutely right, and that the offending group is so wrong that they are worthy of being exterminated or forced to believe in their ideology. The "Light" is what guides both groups, and yet this causes such a great conflict that it can, and often does, override any good that the "Light" can offer. Of course, wars and conflicts can originate from the "Dark" as well, usually manifesting in a selfish desire to acquire wealth or land, however wars usually have a predominant ideological element to them, a "greater reason" that promotes "the greater good".

As for the "Dark" when it comes to how it may provide good rather than evil? There are individuals, who despite being indoctrinated by their societies and cultures on the norms of what should and shouldn't be, nonetheless still focus on their own ideas of what is right and what is wrong. And if most of the individuals in their society or culture does something that goes against their own sense of what right and wrong, they will react against it or otherwise conspire, provided that they have enough strength and courage to do so. Such an action derived from a completely individualistic moral code is entirely (or at least mostly) selfish in nature, but it can lead to what is considered good, and it could prevent further atrocities committed by the advocates of the "Light" from happening. It is a very common analogy that what is "Light" is what is good, and what is "Dark" is what is evil. A better way of stating it is that the "Light" is what is selfless and the "Dark" is what is selfish; selflessness has no monopoly on what is good, and likewise selfishness does not always lead to evil.

With the aforesaid taken into account, it is clear that nations and cultures generally form from the "Light", for most individuals have the aim to identify themselves with others and become something greater than they ever could through their own individual means, even if that requires lessening or even obliterating their individual identity. Virtually all cultures and congregations want world unity and peace, however they more often than not fail to realize that such a goal is pretty much impossible to obtain, and nearly every attempt made in that direction leads, either immediately or eventually, to endless strife and suffering. In order for true peace to be obtained on a worldwide scale, the diversity and the divergence of the human race must be taken as fact and respected as such; however, this may never happen, for most individuals fear and reject what is different from them, and either shun them, force them to change or eliminate them. It is in human nature for an individual to want others to think and behave just like themselves, and this seems to show no sign of lessening in nearly any political movement or congregation. The goal of politics is to obtain power over others; some politicians want power simply for its own sake, but a fair amount see it as a means to an end, in order to change the behaviors of others. Unfortunately, such people have gotten so skilled at this art that they can, to a limited degree, change the very nature of a person's thoughts. As of right now, there is a significant minority in the general population that is aware of this, and can identify it when it happens, however the psychological techniques used to mold people's minds may become so advanced and subtle that no one will be able to know when or how it happens. To control the thoughts that an individual can have directly leads to how they are, how they identify themselves, and how they act, and most of those in power are intelligent enough to know that.

As shunned as the "Dark" is, it may in reality be the only viable way to eliminate conflicts on a mass scale. Those oriented towards the "Dark" focus on their own identity, their own

desires, and their own sense of values. Can this lead to conflict? To a certain degree, absolutely. One may be so selfish that they will be inconsiderate of others, or perhaps use them as some sort of object. But this is generally only on the individual level; when one investigates more closely into the worldly affairs of humanity, there are almost never any real “dark cabals” or “the big bad guys”, for the vast majority of nations and congregations do not commit evil for its own sake; granted, they can and often do commit evil actions, but it is usually as a means to an end, or some form of revenge. Quite a few of them may sincerely believe that they are doing what is truly right, and that they are trying to counter the wrongs of the offenders. However, it is not uncommon for all parties involved to feel this way about themselves, so as such it reveals the subjectiveness and complexity of morals and values. While the “Light” shuns everything that it does not illuminate, the “Dark” accepts anything and everything, and this attitude towards individuality, morality and existence would perhaps paradoxically make the world a more peaceful place, at least in some ways.

So, when one gets right down to it, what is the best way to be? Perhaps rather than choosing one or the other, it can be said that there is no singular way to be. Both the “Light” and the “Dark” have their advantages and disadvantages; if the “Light” was solely chosen, there would be far more organization and stability for individual groups but far more conflict in general, whereas if the “Dark” was solely chosen, individuals would be free to be themselves and there would be less world-scale conflict, however nations and cultures would more than likely start to disintegrate. Can one truly embrace both? That is debatable and for the most part probably unlikely, for the “Light” requires one to abandon the ego in favor of the ideals of the group, whereas the “Dark” forsakes the ideals of the group in order to strengthen the ego; with this aspect considered, the two are indeed mutually exclusive, or at least they appear that way. But perhaps in a way it is possible, in that one does not have to embrace both but rather allow both ways to exist. Those who gravitate towards the “Light” can form their own congregations while allowing those who are either unable or unwilling to join to be left alone, and those who gravitate towards the “Dark” can choose to tolerate the congregations provided that they are not persecuted or manipulated. This would take a lot of wide-scale emotional maturity and awareness for humanity to pull off, but it is not impossible. Perhaps the recognition of the facts that the human race is meant to diverge, rather than converge and that any worldwide ideology and culture would be almost impossible to implement and maintain (at least for very long) would enable others to become more tolerant of one another, and as such a true, longer lasting peace can come about.

## **Chapter Five: Occult Relevance**

Within the occult, the terms “Light” and “Dark” are often used, however there is usually very little definition given to them outside of the definitions that were stated previously. However, there are terms that are used to describe the aforesaid dynamics in relatively good detail; these terms are “Service-to-Self” (STS) and “Service-to-Others” (STO). The “Service-to-Self” term is one that would lead one to believe that could only be applied towards those who are entirely selfish in nature and generally keep to themselves, however this is not the case. Rather, those who gravitate towards the “Service-to-Self” dynamic are those who try to manipulate and overpower others to get them to believe in and carry out



what they think is just and right, if morality even plays a role. They are the founders and the orchestrators of the congregations, overriding the egos and wills of others in order to get everyone that they can control (or at least would want to control) into submitting to what they think is best for their own selves. This is usually done out of ill will or some grossly inflated sense of self-worth and self-righteousness, although it could be said that there are some STS individuals who truly do believe in what they think is just and right, but nonetheless go about bringing justice and righteousness through negative and harmful means. It is not hard to notice a trend within the dynamics of the STS phenomena; it almost exactly mirrors the dynamics of the "Light" as was previously stated. However, there is still a distinction, in that the "Light" is supposedly selfless whereas STS is obviously completely selfish in nature. A point can be made that this difference essentially makes no difference, in that the dynamics of both, while somewhat different in their psychological origination, nonetheless lead to the same results. This point would be an entirely valid one to make, however it could be countered in that a congregation led by a well-meaning but delusional individual of the "Light" would likely have a different trajectory than a congregation led by a purely selfish, amoral and inconsiderate STS individual. Knowing how both violence, needless sacrifice and suffering can, and often do, originate from both types of congregations, this may make little difference in the end and therefore may be irrelevant, however the type of leadership that a congregation has usually guides the development of the congregation as well as how they will go about their endeavors, and given that the characteristics of a "Light" individual and a STS individual are usually vastly different, it may be possible that such congregations led under such individuals would at least sometimes be fairly different from one another.

From this, it can be said that despite the complete selfish orientation of an STS individual, they nonetheless are very similar to the dynamic of the "Light" in their actions. Would this make them significantly distinguishable from the dynamics of the "Dark"? It may be possible that this is the case. Like the STS individuals, "Dark" individuals are selfish in nature, however they are mostly centered around themselves and generally have no interest in joining congregations, let alone forming and manipulating them. Whatever they value, they find in other sources outside of humanity deems to be valuable, and whatever they want, they can generally rely only on themselves to obtain it. A "Dark" individual may have a sense of righteousness and justice that is counter to what most other individuals believe in, but such an individual would seldom force their will on others or try to get them to change; instead, the individual would try to subtly or subversively change things on an individual level, relying on no one else besides themselves. As such, a key distinction can be made, in that the "Dark" individual does not want any part in congregations and operates on a purely individual level, whereas the STS individual absolutely depends on the existence of congregations and needs to manipulate and control them in order to obtain what they want.

Then there is the other dynamic, "Service-to-Others" (STO). This dynamic would give off the impression that such an individual that falls under that category is fundamentally selfless and will go out of their way to serve and help others without asking anything in return. In general, this impression would be accurate. However, there are some flaws, or at least exceptions, to this impression, with the main one being that while explicitly and consciously an STO may not make any demands out of others and may at least try to accept others for

what they are, implicitly and subconsciously they might try to “bring out the best” in others so that they can conform to what the STO individual thinks is virtuous and right. This subtle form of manipulation is relatively benign in comparison to the actions of the standard STS individual, however it is still manipulation used to have others conform to a standard held by others. While a STO individual is typically willing to help anyone who they deemed need to be helped, they would nonetheless prefer to help those who are the most similar to them, or at least also those who have potential to become like them. That is simply human nature; humans in general prefer to help and associate with those who are similar to them ethnically, culturally, or psychologically. Even though these individuals are indeed generally selfless and have good intentions, their actions eventually become organized in some form or another and congregations arise in the same form as the dynamics of the “Light”. From this point, they can either remain relatively true to their original purpose or mission and as a result are only minimally corrupted, or they are either infiltrated by STS individuals and warped by their manipulative actions into becoming something that is quite different from what they originally had in mind. Of course, congregations can become warped and corrupted on their own without the influence of STS individuals; the selfless devotion to genuinely help others and promote ideals that can better humanity generally only lasts for so long. Emotions and thoughts are finite, and while they can be given greater longevity when shared by a congregation, they eventually fade away or transmogrify over time.

It is clear from this description of STO that most, if not all, of those individuals who gravitate toward the “Light” would fall into this category. However, what of those individuals who gravitate toward the “Dark”? Such people could perhaps indeed fall into the philosophy of the STO in that they generally accept others for what they truly are, and would make no overt attempt to change them. However, the impulse to help others in a selfless manner may be lacking in the individuals who are “Dark” aligned. For such individuals focus almost solely on their own needs and desires, and while they may be unwilling to manipulate or use other people in order to fulfill them, they are seldom concerned with the needs and desires of others, for they view the task of fulfilling them as purely individual; the “Dark” individual should not depend on others to obtain what they want, and others should do the same. The “Dark” aligned individual can feel the need to help others, and sometimes does, however they do not want to form a bond of dependency towards or from anyone, unless perhaps if the individuals involved have gotten fairly close for a lengthy period of time. Generally, when a “Dark” individual helps others, it is either in the form of a basic favor (such as changing a tire on someone's car or donating rice noodles and beef broth to a food bank), or it is from their insights and discoveries into subjects and fields of either the world, existence or human nature that very few have come upon and from these relatively original thoughts, the one who receives the advice or counsel of the “Dark” individual may begin to see situations in a new light, and thus be able to live one's life better or solve a problem that otherwise had no solution. Many philosophers, mystics and scientists were people who deviated from the norms and values of the societies that they were apart of, and instead of thinking, believing or saying what others wanted them to, they went off into the great unknown and acquired knowledge in the metaphorical darkness that turned out to be beneficial to humanity. For what is feared, is not always what is harmful and detrimental, and what is loved, is not always what is best.

So as such, would it be an accurate statement to make that those who resonate with the "Light" are primarily STO, and that "Dark" aligned individuals seem to not be bound by this dichotomy? It would appear so, however it must be stated that STS individuals can be barely distinguished from the dynamics of the "Light" in their actions, to the point where they sometimes could very well be people who sincerely resonate with the "Light". For the dynamics of "Light" and "Dark" have little, if any bearing, on how moral or truly virtuous someone is; it is simply concerned with whether or not someone is oriented around congregations or societies or if someone is individualistic in nature. Given that STS individuals, despite their selfish need to carry out their wants and desires, are in fact highly oriented around congregations to the point where they really couldn't function without one in order to live a fulfilling life, it becomes relatively clear that they are far more "Light" in their character than they are "Dark". Perhaps this reveals that the "Selfish versus Selfless" dichotomy is not a true, or at least an exact, analogy when compared to "Light versus Dark". In fact, it may be said that any other dichotomy cannot be used to fully define it. For while "Good versus Evil" is a very popular analogy used to describe it in basic terms, from the aforesaid statements in this document it is fairly obvious that evil deeds and consequences can arise from the dynamics of the "Light" (and they often do), and conversely, many wonderful discoveries and beneficial knowledge can arise from the dynamics of the "Dark". As such, there is really only one way to define the "Light versus Dark" dichotomy outside of social/personal orientation, and would be that what is "Light" is what is embraced and loved by most, and what is "Dark" is what is generally unknown and/or feared.

It may seem that there is no other subject within the Occult that can apply to the dynamics of "Light" and "Dark", however there is one more: the subject of gnosis. Gnosis, is essentially the mystical and psychological approach to the supernatural and spiritual; it is defined by becoming enlightened through knowledge and insight, rather than through faith or any other emotional dynamic. Congregations in general, have their ideals and values based on emotion and faith; there are exceptions to this (in particular, some intellectual circles), however this is the general trend. Those who are oriented around congregations base their beliefs and actions on the standards that others set; they are not mindless in that they may not follow it down to the exact detail, and they may question certain things about the standards, however they generally do not question them most of the time. What is their rationale for this? Some of them are so simple-minded that they simply think that because others follow these standards, that they should in turn follow in suit, for they have the notion that the majority must usually, if not always, be right. Either this is because they cannot think for themselves, or are unwilling to, or they simply fear rejection. Rejection from their congregation is perhaps the worst thing that could possibly ever happen for many congregation-oriented individuals. As such, they allow others to make the calls for what is true and what is false, and what is right and what is wrong, on the basis that they simply must believe it. Of course, there are a fair amount of other congregation-oriented individuals who do sometimes question what the rest of the members are doing, or what the leadership is doing, however they still have the fear of rejection, as well as the notion that while the majority may not always be right, they are generally at least sensible and more right than wrong. As such, these people fall into the faith-trap as well. It may surprise the reader that this social dynamic is present in almost every group, no matter how educated they are. In every formal, established field or organization,

there are things that should not be believed in, and things that must be held in high regard, as well as things that shouldn't be thought about and things that shouldn't ever be said.

The individuals who are "Dark" aligned generally do not fall victim into the faith-trap, for due to their individualistic and relatively selfish nature, they focus more on what they themselves believe in or have come to know, rather than what others believe in or would want them to believe. Can "Dark" aligned individuals nonetheless give in to faith rather than insight? It is not only possible, but faith is perhaps the psychological starting point of the "Dark" aligned individual; they may see the errors in the thoughts, feelings and behaviors of the other individuals that surround them, however they will likely have a lack of insight into their own thoughts and emotions. Instead of questioning their own thoughts and emotions, as well as the reasons or mechanisms behind them, they may simply think that whatever thought or emotion that they have is automatically justified, and as such they are unwilling to speculate further and thus continue to be the way they are. To think and believe that one's thoughts and emotions are always there for a reason and must not be questioned, is a form of faith, one that is relatively uncommon among "Light" aligned individuals due to their group-oriented nature but nonetheless is very common among those who are "Dark" aligned. Such a form of faith, can lead to the construction and the maintenance of delusions, which are not unheard of for a "Dark" aligned individual to possess. Delusions can be held by anyone, either by someone who bases their thoughts, values and behaviors on the standards of a congregation or by someone who is entirely selfish and individualistic, however delusions that are held by the masses seem to be less harmful to possess, for if one's delusions is held by several others then they will likely receive less trouble, alienation and grief for them. The "Dark" aligned individual who holds delusions will almost certainly have delusions that only center around their own sense of values and beliefs, and as such few, if anyone, could be able to understand them and correct them in the proper way. If such an individual continues to go down this route in real life, then they will likely be rejected and potentially alone for the rest of their earthly existence.

It takes a fair amount of both life experience and emotional maturity to overcome the formation of delusions, as well as to come to the fact that not every thought or emotion that one has is automatically justified. This is equally difficult for both "Light" and "Dark" aligned individuals alike. The process that leads to the same conclusion, however, differs between the two groups. With the "Light" aligned individuals, they must come to the realization that not every belief or value that either their congregation, nation or culture espouses is automatically right; they must learn how to think for themselves, to start seeing things outside of the parameters of their congregation from an objective perspective, and to stop automatically believing in whatever they are told by their authorities. With the "Dark" aligned individuals, they must realize that while their thoughts and emotions are indeed true to themselves to at least some degree, that they are purely individual, and do not always apply on either a mass scale or a cosmic/worldwide-scale; they must also learn that they do not have perfect insight into themselves, and as such can come to conclusions and beliefs that do not match up with objective reality. Either way, it takes quite a while for an individual to realize the error of their ways, and to root out the source of their incorrect thoughts and irrational emotions.

What could be the opposite of a delusion? The answer to that is obvious; the opposite of a

delusion is a belief in something that is absolutely true and accurate. However, it can be said that there is no solid definition of truth, or at the very least the boundaries of truth are relatively porous and amorphous. Truth, in all likelihood, changes throughout the course of time and is most likely plural, and not singular. This may sound absurd, but this possibility of absurdity can be countered by the fact that multiple individuals may emotionally react to the same event in the world in a different way, and can learn about its happening at different times, and perceive and think about it in different ways. While the source of all these individual reactions is indeed singular, the facts and happenings of the individual reactions is plural and diverse. If one truth can produce two different reactions within two individuals and yet both can be true, then this illustrates the plurality of truth. The "Light" aligned in general seem to believe that there is only one singular truth that never changes and that every individual should think about it, feel about it and react to it in the same way. For the former belief, it is true that there are indeed some truths that remain unchanged throughout the course of time; the abstract concept of numbers would be a prime example of this. However, if there was to be a singular truth, it would have to mean that all truths are related in some way, in either concrete or abstract terms. The author can only think of one absolute truth that applies to everything and potentially connects everything together, and that is the declaration of "Everything that exists, exists, and everything that has existed, has." That is both a very simple statement to make, as well as a potentially profound one. It is simple in that it is a circular argument that reinforces itself; going into logical circles while having a philosophical argument with someone is usually one surefire way of getting both laughed at and out of the argument. However, its implications can have far reaching effects; essentially, it implies that everything that you see, think, feel, and interact with is all real, to at least some degree. Having a certain thought about something, such as rocks being softer than mushrooms, is obviously not true, however the very possibility that having such a thought can exist is, in fact, true. Existence is the foundation of truth, and perhaps the only thing that can connect everything else together.

As for the latter belief of the aforesaid sentiment of the "Light" aligned, this is simply either a revealing of their need to manipulate others to get to see, think and feel how they do, and/or a reflection of their deep insecurity. Manipulation is used to reinforce their belief overtly, whereas insecurity is from their fear that what they believe may indeed be potentially wrong, but if their beliefs are shared by others, then it could potentially make them correct in their beliefs. Either way, it stems from a desire to have others support and subscribe to what they think is true and right. They absolutely need the truth to be singular, for if it is not, then it is either extremely difficult if not downright impossible to form a single system of belief and behaviors that can be unanimously followed. This need is primarily emotional in nature, although it can be intellectualized in order to reinforce the system of belief.

With that said, would humanity be better off with only one system of belief and behaviors? Barring the almost certain fact that it would be impossible, there could be some good in it, in that there really would be far less conflict if everyone agreed to share the same values and standards of behavior, however it could very well be said that if this ever did happen, then the advancement of humanity would suddenly slow down, if not entirely stop or even go backwards. For growth, requires people to explore, inspect and question, and if everything was agreed upon and if everything that was deemed worthy of knowing was known, then

there would be nothing left to do any of the three actions. Humanity wouldn't just simply move in only one direction in the metaphysical realm of possibility, it would stop at one point and construct a circular boundary against everything that was deemed unworthy, and all energy and effort from then on would be to keep all unwanted thoughts, feelings, needs and desires out. Keep in mind that this dynamic would not have real, known truth as its catalyst, but rather what is believed to be true, mainly from the emotional or superficial convictions of everyone who subscribes to the system of belief. It is not possible for one to know all that is true, and it is not possible for all to come to terms with what is known to be true, even if all knowable truths were discovered by various talented individuals and revealed to humanity at large. Every individual has their own psychological profile and emotional constitution that is at least partially unique to them, and as such not everything can be clearly communicated or agreed upon, for better or worse. As such, this should be respected, and no efforts should be made to have everyone try to conform to an absolute system, at least one that goes beyond the bare minimum necessary to ensure less conflict.

Back again, to the subject of gnosis. With the definition of gnosis being coming to enlightenment through knowledge and insight rather than by faith, is it possible for both the "Light" and the "Dark" aligned to successfully achieve it? To a certain degree, gnosis does not exclude either group, however it does seem to favor those who are "Dark" aligned. Why is this? Essentially, all individuals are unique, if not from their psychological and emotional makeup, then from the individual lives that they have, for every person who currently lives, and has ever lived, has undergone a series of events and situations that pertain only to them. The threads of destiny that weave the fabric of the human race are indeed connected, but the threads themselves were woven from a purely individual source, and it is almost impossible that any two threads are the same, at least completely. The "Dark" aligned, by nature, are individualistic in their psychological and social orientation, and as such they would perhaps be more capable and more willing to try to see their inner nature, such as how their minds work, why they desire what they desire, why certain things happened to them, why they became the way they did, and so on. Most "Light" aligned individuals also ask themselves these questions, however they often do not seek the answers from within themselves, but rather from without; instead of trying to find the sources from within their own lives and minds, they are far more likely to look towards the cosmic forces and claim that something happened to them due to "fate" or "God's plan", or when they question why they are the way they are, they will often come to the conclusion that God made them that way, and thus they should keep to the same course. Thus, they usually look no further, at least from within.

The "Dark" aligned individuals, nonetheless, can have issues with finding knowledge and insight into their own nature, as well as the mysteries of life and existence. For instance, they may be so wrapped up in their own emotional dynamics and delusions that they simply cannot see past themselves, in fact they may not be aware that these very things are preventing them from seeing the clearer picture of the plural truth. With enough education and emotional guidance, however, they can eventually overcome this, and when their emotions and delusions are kept in check they will be far more likely to understand themselves, as well as how their life has played out and how it will continue to progress in the future. The "Dark" aligned can have almost as many problems as the "Light" aligned with obtaining gnosis, but they have the primary advantage in that they do not depend on

others to label them and define who and what they are; they are far closer to the individual source of the truths of their lives than probably even the most intelligent and gifted "Light" aligned individual, for even the most troubled of them know that all things about their character have their source from within. Essentially, all things in the individual's life start with them, and end with them, and that is one of the first things that the "Dark" aligned individual comes to realize when they reach psychological maturity.

But "Light" aligned individuals can achieve gnosis as well, for gnosis is about achieving enlightenment through knowledge and insight, and makes no distinction if this is either on an individual or a congregational level. It is true that congregation-oriented individuals often cannot have much insight into themselves, but there are still truths that they can come to realize outside of themselves. And indeed, there are many things that one can learn within the workings of a congregation that one could not learn from just individual introspection. How to get along with others and make compromises are two primary skills that the "Light" aligned individuals tend to quickly learn, whereas the "Dark" aligned individuals seem to have at least some problems with doing either. The key to obtaining gnosis, in the case of the "Light" aligned individual, would be to have insight into the truths outside of themselves; they would have to look into the workings, the characteristics and the implications of the congregation, as well as how the individuals within it interact with one another. There are certain academic fields, such as sociology, anthropology and social psychology that rely on insight into how humans function on the congregational level, and a "Light" aligned individual would be wise to look into these fields in order to obtain more knowledge as well as to finally achieve gnosis.

The term "gnosis" has very spiritual implications, in fact it seems that its first usage was among the mystics and the theologians, as well as perhaps certain philosophers. Keep in mind, however, that the enlightenment that gnosis can bring does not necessarily have to be spiritual in nature, however it can and likely will explain many spiritual things that were previously unknown to the one that has finally obtained it. Gnosis, is essentially just a higher level of knowledge and insight, and perhaps nothing more. Many people, both in the past and in present day, have tried to find ways to gnosis in order to obtain Godhood or some other higher form of being, and they more or less all failed or will fail, for they never understood the limitations of being human, with the main limitation that once one is born human, one will remain that until they die. To truly arrive at gnosis is not to transcend the limitations of humanity, but rather to finally know them and understand them, in order to use one's individual being to the greatest extent possible; ironically, it is through the recognition of one's limitations that almost solely gives way to the possibility of transcending them.

Looking from within, and seeking from without, seem to be both viable ways to achieve gnosis, although it must be said that it probably requires both the ability and the willingness to perform both tasks. Finally achieving gnosis can give the individual the sense that they have finally come to discover all that is true, but such a person must realize that the truth is plural, and not singular; they must accept the fact that the truths that they have discovered, at least partially apply only to them. If such a person fails to acknowledge this, then they may try to influence others in order to get them to believe in what is deemed to be the absolute truth, to the point where a congregation may form around it. Such a conviction based on the

error of not recognizing the fact that the truth affects each individual differently, as it should, can lead to grave mistakes and perhaps less opportunities to obtain enlightenment for others. For if such an effort is successful in convincing others to believe, or otherwise forcing others to accept, then there will be a uniform set of beliefs in truths that cannot truly apply to every single individual, and everything else will be cast aside. The rejection of the plural truth, as well as the enforcement of standards that individuals "have" to obey and "have" to live up to, will lead to a general psychological and spiritual retardation in not only the individuals, but also the whole of humanity at large. Those who enforce these "absolute" truths will come to see that the truth is singular and does not change, so as such humanity will be stuck in a stagnant, degenerate and oppressive state until they realize that the truth is plural in nature and almost never stays the same. From only this recognition, can change and evolution truly happen on any significant level. True enlightenment comes not only from the recognition of boundaries, but also from the fact that only existence and time are eternal, and that everything is subject to change. If one heeds this, then they will be able to adapt, and advance onward to being better than they were formally; if one doesn't, then they will confine themselves and stay stuck in time, only metaphysically rotting and never growing.

From all of this, it is perhaps very obvious that the Occult in general is highly relevant to the concepts and the dynamics of the "Light" and the "Dark"; for the former, the terms practically originated from the Occult, and for the latter, the Occult was perhaps the first field to study them. Many people, in particular "Light" aligned individuals, either disregard the Occult or fear it, for it resembles all knowledge that is either hidden, or not plainly known. For the common person, they do not want to focus on things that can not be readily known, for not only does it make less sense, but they also have a primal, subtle fear about such things. As for science, the Occult is neither fully defined nor completely consistent, and as such it is disregarded by most professionals due to its apparent vagueness and seeming impracticality. However, not all things that are true operate on an apparent system that is entirely consistent, and fear should never keep someone from learning more about the truths of existence and humanity. Not to mention that many things that have been deemed useful in this present day were once seen as being impractical and apparently useless in the past (the invention of the steam engine being one), so as such that is not an optimal attitude to have in order to advance further on, either. With these things in mind, it must be countered that the human mind absolutely depends on seeming consistency in order to understand a subject, and that humans have fear engrained in them to the point where it would be completely impossible to entirely get rid of it. The sense of practicality has also indeed proven to be very useful for the maintenance of daily life as well as society, so as such one cannot just throw that out of the metaphorical window. As such, in order to truly advance further towards a better direction, humanity would have to become more educated as to how their minds work as well as how to control and counter their emotional reactions; essentially, humans would have to learn how to become more than human, or at least something else. This seems entirely absurd and within the realm of fantasy, but if one looks back towards how humanity was thousands of years ago, or perhaps even just mere hundreds of years ago, one could potentially see how radically different humanity is compared to the humans of that era. And to be frank, humanity probably still has quite a ways to go, barring the possibility of mass extinction. Change through evolution will happen whether or not humans want it to, and it is



up to those who are willing to control their destiny to have humanity change for the better, rather than for the worse.

This chapter not only revealed the relevance of the Occult to the dynamics of “Light” and “Dark”, but it also revealed how the concepts from the Occult can give the dynamics as well as the terms far more meaning and depth. If it wasn't for the Occult, very little could have been said about either “Light” or “Dark” outside of how they manifest on the intrapersonal and interpersonal level; it simply would have been a matter of psychology and sociology. But from the concepts that originate from the Occult, the metaphorical darkness that remained within the subject of the dynamics was at least partially illuminated, and thus more knowledge was brought to light. Despite the common rejection of the Occult, it can be used to show how things truly are, if it is used properly and if one is willing to recognize and accept the results. Overcome the fear that originates from the lack of insight, the inability to either look into the darkness or past the light, for when the fear is overcome, the unknown will eventually become known with time and effort, and all knowledge can potentially be used towards individual progress and the optimal advancement of humankind in the end. Perhaps it is not true that the only thing to fear is fear itself, but fear is indeed the thing that one can be most afraid of.

## **Chapter Six: Conclusion**

With the concepts and the dynamics between “Light” and “Dark” explained and detailed to the best of the author's ability, one cannot shake the feeling that there is still far more to be said. Despite all of the metaphors, analogies and Occult references, it seems as if the dynamics between “Light” and “Dark” are still mostly unknown, and in the darkness. Perhaps this reflects the possibility that the very nature of humanity mostly resides in the darkness, which is somewhat ironic for almost all sciences and schools of thought, which reside in the light, are primarily based on the nature of humanity. There were many comparisons made between the duality of “Light” and “Dark” with other dualities, however no exact comparison or analogy could be made. This might be because the nature of humanity on almost any level has many factors and is highly complex in both composition and dynamics, and yet the duality of “Light” and “Dark” is the result of the nature of humanity manifesting on the surface, primarily the social and cultural aspect.

But this grand ambiguity should not deter anyone from trying to understand further. For if one stops, there will be absolutely no way to understand anything more about how humans truly are, and this would be a serious obstacle against further progress or evolution, one that would perhaps be impossible to get around. It was said in the beginning of this document that the duality of “Light” and “Dark” explained herein was intentionally made to be simple in order for anyone to understand and thus develop upon it further when the time came. While this does not remove any errors made in the attempt to define or explain the dynamics, it was still an acknowledgment that there is only so much that is currently known about the nature of humanity, and as such, this both prompts and encourages further discoveries and rectifications.

Perhaps the nature of humanity cannot be completely put into mere words, or defined by rigid systems or dualities. This would make sense, for human cognition seems to form from

without, rather than from within. The thoughts that one is able to form are based from the experiences and observations of the outside environment, and while emotions are indeed intrinsic in nature, they are generally evoked from outside stimuli. It is from this understanding, that one can see how most individuals are "Light" aligned, for it is from the experiences and perceptions from the visible world that prompts the development of a functioning mind, and as such they seek their meaning and values from without, rather than from their individual source. Is the "Dark" aligned individual inferior in this aspect? It is possible that some are, in that they do not perceive what is visible in the correct fashion and as such try to find their meaning and values through their undeveloped mind. However, it is just as possible that some or even most "Dark" aligned individuals are more evolved, in that they know that all that one can see and experience is not all that is truly there, and they see themselves as the sole source of their thoughts and emotions; they learn how to see past the world, and look into themselves and try to find what truly resonates within them. As such, it might be said that the "Light" is the baseline of humanity, whereas the "Dark" represents all that diverge from it, good or bad.

Perhaps the greatest thing to learn from this document, is that ambiguity exists because there is still so much more that humanity does not understand, and that these ambiguities should be understood in order for humanity to come to terms with itself, and evolve in the right direction. An ambiguity, despite what most people like to believe, does not represent either an impossibility or a contradiction, rather it represents something that has yet to be fully known, a body of knowledge that resides in the darkness. And if humanity is brave enough to go forth into the darkness, to be honest with themselves that all that is clear and easily understood is not all that truly is, they will likely profit from the endeavor. Unfortunately, it will perhaps never be possible for all of humanity to come to terms with this, so in turn the responsibility relies on the "Dark" aligned individuals who value knowledge over certainty, and those who will not let fear get the better of them. It takes a strong psychological constitution to prefer the unknown to the known, to prefer what is not commonly valued over what is, but it can be achieved by almost anyone if they are willing to make the effort. Humanity may still have quite a ways to go from having their identity and values based on the descriptions and conditions of others, but humans are quite a bit more educated and worldly than they were formally, so there is hope that an evolution towards a better direction will take place.

Even if something cannot be entirely explained or understood, do not stop there. It is one thing to accept one's ignorance, but it is a highly disastrous thing to prefer it. Knowledge of a morbid or vague topic can cause harm in the short term, but it seems to always do well in the long term. If one piece of advice is to be given to someone who chooses to explore the metaphysical darkness, it should be the recognition that emotions always fade over time, but knowledge is potentially eternal. And what is eternal, should never be shunned or shut out of awareness.